

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgements

1. This Office action responds to the Amendments and Remarks filed by the Applicants on 04 January 2010.
2. Claims 1-14 and 19-24 are pending.
3. Claims 1-14 and 19-24 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
6. Claim 6 recites "The method of claim 1, including creating a domain of a plurality of devices of the set of devices that are related to a household or limited group of consumers". The claim is indefinite because it is not clear to one of ordinary skill in the art as to how the method of claim 1 is creating "a domain of a plurality of devices ...". The method of claim 1 lists the method steps of a) associating usage rights with content item", b) decomposing usage rights, c) digitally signing the decomposed rights and d) providing content item and the rights to a client system. It is not clear if the language is deficient or the Applicant is claiming grouping of devices of the client system claimed in

claim 1 or in the alternative, the Applicant is using the terms "domain" and "user" interchangeably.

7. Claim 10 recites "sign at least one partial right of the set of signed partial rights to create at least one other signed partial right". The claim is indefinite because it is not clear if the claim language is meant to recite signing the already signed partial right "a second time" by the "machine of the provider" as recited in claim 1 from which claim 10 depends or the signed partial right is signed for the second time by "a device at a client site".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-12, 14 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards et al. (WO 01/63387) in view of Okamoto et al. (US 2004/0054678) further in view of Tadayon (US 2005/0187877).

3. With respect to claims 1, 16 and 18:

4. Richards discloses a method of controlling access ("control and/or enforce use rights and access rights", ¶ [0004]) to a content item ("Content", ¶¶ [0039] and [0137]) in a system comprising a set of devices ("a user/subscriber/apparatus 42", ¶ [0060] and Fig. 1 item 42)

- a. Associating, by a provider ("provider of the data", ¶ [003]) of a content item, at least one usage right ("use right", Abstract and ¶ [0006]) with the content item ("Content", ¶¶ [0039] and [0137])
- b. Decomposing, by the provider, the usage right into a set of partial rights ("also allows an owner of the data to define rules for rendering, accessing, and using the encoded data.", ¶ [0026])
- c. separately signing, by a machine of provider, each partial right of the set of partial rights ("Such rules can be a part of an encoding scheme.", ¶ [0026]) resulting in a corresponding set of signed partial rights.
- d. Richards discloses a policy component that define recipient's access rights to the data, such as the rights to "read/write", "save encoded", "save open", "no save", "server keyed", "render 1", "render 2", "Age 1", "Age 2", and "Use", etc. (¶¶ [0026] and [0068]) but does not explicitly disclose naming the separate rights as "partial rights".
- e. However, Okamoto teaches a "partial right" that is a subset of a right range.
- f. Therefore it would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the secure content distribution service to a group of devices in a domain as disclosed by Richards with the system of a distribution device storing a group of digital contents with right management information to facilitate "partial right" distribution as taught by Okamoto for the purposes of user convenience, fair distribution and cost effectiveness, since so

doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

g. Richards discloses authentication using existing standards for authentication such as a digital signature method or a public/private key exchange (§ [0096]) as part of an encoded scheme for transfer of content between devices, but does not explicitly disclose each one being separately signed.

h. However, Tadayon teaches using multiple signatures a content can manage and record its rights ("the rights to change, edit, copy, sign, or the like, can be passed on from the owner to the user. Associated with one or more of these rights can be document tracking actions. For example, using a digital signature, a document can manage and record its path of distribution, recording each user's interactivity with the document, including, for example, any assignment and/or distribution action, or any other information that may be relevant. Therefore, it is possible that a document will have associated therewith multiple signatures that represent, for example, a "snapshot" of the document as it was available to that particular user", § [0029]).

i. Therefore it would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the secure content distribution service to a group of devices in a domain as disclosed by Richards with the system of a content distribution involving multiple digital signatures as the content and its rights are modified for the purpose of added security and prevent unauthorized

content access, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

j. Providing, by the machine, the content item and the set of signed partial rights to a device ("Television or desktop or Laptop", Item 42 of Fig. 1) of a set of devices as a client system (Item 42 of Fig. 1).

5. With respect to claim 2:

6. Richards discloses wherein at least one device in the set of devices is able to access ("a remote access device", ¶ [0060]) and exercise at least one partial right of the set of signed partial rights ("incorporating at least one encoded use right", Abstract) after verification of the signed partial right.

7. With respect to claim 3:

8. Richards discloses wherein one partial right of the set of signed partial rights associated with the content item comprises one of a render right, a transfer right, an offer right, a derivative work right, and a utility right ("rendering the decoded data type in accordance with the decoded use right", ¶ [0018])

9. With respect to claim 4:

10. Richards discloses wherein at least one partial right of the set of signed partial rights can only be exercised a limited number of times ("The "use" element defines the number of times that the data may be accessed or used", ¶ [0068]).

11. With respect to claim 5:

12. Richards discloses including verifying (“the remote apparatus determines whether the password or signature is valid in block 212”, ¶ [0120]) whether the at least one partial right and an authorization of the provider have both not been revoked before exercising the at least one partial right.

13. With respect to claim 6:

14. Richards discloses including creating a domain of a plurality of devices of the set of devices that are related to a household or limited group of consumers (Fig. 1, item 42).

15. With respect to claims 7 and 8:

16. Richards discloses wherein a required protection level of at least one partial right of the set of partial rights is indicated along with the at least one partial right and derived implicitly from a type of the at least one partial right (“A composite file header is generated for the complete encoded file and for individual data types and is comprised of the pointers to each individual encoded data type and information that allows the process to control its logic and encode level. The logic and level flow information defines what key or key set are used to decode and how the decoding process occurs”, ¶¶ [0151], [0072], [0092] and [0120]).

17. With respect to claims 9 and 10:

18. Richards discloses including allowing the device, to identify a different device, sign information that includes at least one partial right of the set of partial rights and at least one of: an identification of the domain, an identification of the different device, and information about length and validity of the partial right to create a signed information

item, and transfer this signed information item to the different device (“the persistent data control application passes the unique machine identifier to the secure server where the machine identifier is in the registry database and is used as one of the encode/decode keys for that specific remote apparatus”, ¶ [0090]).

19. With respect to claim 11:

20. Richards discloses wherein the different device is a member of a different domain (Fig. 1, Item 42 and item 52).

21. With respect to claim 12:

22. Richards discloses including verifying, by the device, that the different device is at least one of being compliant and being non revoked (“remote apparatus retrieves the unique machine identifier, e.g., manufacturer's serial number, of that apparatus and uses it as one of the decode/encode keys. If the decode is successful, the apparatus has been validated”, ¶ [0089]).

23. With respect to claim 14:

24. Richards discloses wherein the usage right comprises an offer right (for a specific right) and the method including requesting the provider to execute the offer right and deliver the specific right to a specified third party, delivering, by the provider, the specific right directly to the specified third party (“authentication methods”, ¶¶ [0048]-[0052]).

25. With respect to claims 20 and 22:

26. Richards discloses a client system (Fig. 1, item 42) comprising: a plurality of devices (“desktop, laptop, television”, item 44 of Fig. 1) that are interconnected via a network; wherein at least one device includes: a memory that is configured to receive a

content item and a set of signed partial rights from a server system, a digital rights module that is configured to: receive a request for access to the content item from an other device on the network, identify a partial right of the set of signed partial rights corresponding to the request, verify the partial right, and grant the request for access based on verification of the partial right ("At least one of the control fields incorporates the persistent database structure control policy that controls use and/or access rights of a recipient", ¶ [0008]).

27. With respect to claim 24:

28. Richards discloses a server system (Item 52, Fig. 1) comprising: a memory that is configured to store a content item and a usage right associated with the content item, a digital signing element that is configured to decompose the usage right into a set of partial rights and sign each partial right to create a set of signed partial rights, and a transfer element that is configured to transfer the content item and the set of signed partial rights to a client system.

29. Claims 13, 21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Richards, Okamoto and Tadayon as described above and further in view of Lambert (US 7,509,421).

30. With respect to claims 13, 21 and 23:

31. Richards discloses a policy component that define recipient's access rights to the data, such as the rights to "read/write", "save encoded", "save open", "no save", "server

keyed", "render 1", "render 2", "Age 1", "Age 2", and "Use", etc. (¶¶ [0026] and [0068])

but does not explicitly disclose deleting or revoking the rights.

32. However Lambert teaches rights being revoked ("being able to revoke those rights", C. 18, ll. 26-28)

33. Therefore it would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the secure content distribution service to a group of devices in a domain as disclosed by Richards with the digital rights management system capable of revoking the content rights as taught by Lambert for the purposes of added security and prevention of illegal use, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results

Response to Arguments

34. The Applicant's assertion that "nowhere in these paragraphs does Richards teach that the owner separately signs each of these access rights", in lines is not convincing and the Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicants.

35. Richards discloses incorporating encoded use right and/or access right (Abstract) and incorporating at least one encoded use right into one of the control fields of the at least one data type (¶ [0020]) which are functional equivalents of separately signed access rights.

36. The Applicants assert that “while this purpose of added security and prevention of unauthorized access may provide a reason to combine Richards and Tadayon, it does not provide any reason to combine them in the fashion claimed by the applicants”.

37. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

38. Combination of Richards and Tadayon teaches encoding different rights and digitally signing them to track and record the path of distribution, recording each user's interactivity with the document, including, for example, any assignment and/or distribution action, or any other information that may be relevant.

Conclusion

39. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

40. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

41. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MURALI K. DEGA whose telephone number is

(571)270-5394. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday 7.30 to 4.00 ET.

42. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew J. Fischer can be reached on (571)272-6779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

43. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Murali K. Dega/
Art Unit # 3621
March 22, 2010

/EVENS J. AUGUSTIN/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3621